



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

AS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/266,155 03/10/99 PRICE

B MRA-PT001

IM22/0209

VOLPE AND KOENIG  
400 ONE PENN CENTER  
1617 JOHN F KENNEDY BLVD  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103

EXAMINER

JUSKA, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

6

DATE MAILED:

02/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application r proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/266,155

Applicant(s)

Price et al.

Examiner

Cheryl Juska

Group Art Unit

1771



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cheryl Juska

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Tony Volpe

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Feb 6, 2001Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: pending claims in general; claim 2 in particular

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Volpe called to propose an amendment wherein the Jepson format of the claims is eliminated and the term "non-permeable" is deleted, with respect to the polymeric layer. I did not presently have the case in front of me, so I noted that I would contact him after receipt of a formal response, if I thought it helpful in furthering prosecution of the case.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

CHERYL JUSKA  
PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.